REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-17, which are all of the pending claims, under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. patent application publication no. US 2003/0018729 A1 (Miloslavsky) in view of U.S. Patent 6,175,832 (Luzzi, et al.).

Applicants are herein amending independent Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 to better define the subject matters of these claims.

For the reasons discussed below, Claims 1-17 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is, hence, requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-17 and to allow these claims.

The present invention, generally, relates to a procedure for reporting the availability of servers in a distributed data processing system. As discussed in the present application, there are a number of problems associated current systems for reporting server availability, and for example, these reporting systems may be very slow or require huge disk space.

The present invention effectively addresses these problems by, among other things, searching through a sever log file for indicators of, for example, a crash, shutdown or start of the server. When evidence of one of these events is found, data about the event are sent, for example via an e-mail, to one particular server, referred to as the reporting server. The reporting server receives these e-mails from the application servers, processes those e-mails, and reports on the availability of the application servers.

Miloslavsky, the primary reference relied on by the Examiner to reject the claims, discloses a method and system for routing electronic mails to support personnel in a processing center. This system includes a server for receiving the e-mails from senders, an information extractor for extracting information from the e-mails, and a router for routing the e-mails. A database is provided

10   G:\Ibm\1110\14551\amend\14551.AMD1.doc

for storing information about the people who can answer the emails, and the router routes the emails based, in part, on this information.

There is a very important general difference between the present invention and the system disclosed in Miloslavsky – the present invention is directed to reporting on server availability, while Miloslavsky is directed to routing e-mails. This general difference is reflected in a number of more specific differences between this invention and the method and system described in Miloslavsky.

More specifically, in Miloslavsky, they search for keywords such as "bugs," "virus" and "crash" and then decide on where to route the email to a person's mailbox. First of all, they do not scan the log file. Instead, they scan emails from sources like customer or service requests. Secondly, they do not scan for server availability. They scan for some keyword and decide where to route the email to the proper person to handle. Thirdly, the scanning is on keywords only, and this would not be sufficient for server availability reporting. As in the case of a server crash, for example, it is the lack of keywords, such as "shutdown," that indicates a server start without a proper shutdown, hence a result of a crash. That is why the present invention does not merely search for keywords in the log file but has built-in intelligence to infer events such as a crash or shutdown from the log file.

Independent Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 describe important differences between the present invention and Miloslavsky. In particular, Claims 1 and 11 describe the feature that each of the application servers periodically searches <u>a log file of the server</u> for indication of a crash or shutdown or start of the server. Claims 1 and 11 describe the further feature that these application servers send data about these events, and in particular the time of a crash, shutdown or start, as an email to a database on the reporting server. Claim 6, which is directed to a system for reporting availability of a plurality of servers, describes analogous system limitations.

11   G:\Ibm\1110\14551\amend\14551.AMD1.doc

Claim 16, similar to Claim 1, is a method claim, and Claim 16 describes the above-described features of Claim 1 in a more general sense. More specifically, Claim 16 describes the feature that each of the application servers periodically searches a log file of the server for an indication of the occurrence of each of a group of defined conditions for the server, and that the application servers send data about these conditions to the reporting server.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and they too, whether considered individually or in combination, also fail to disclose this principal of the application servers searching through their own log files for indications of certain events, and then sending data about those events, in the form of emails, to the reporting server.

For example, Luzzi discloses a method for availability reporting which uses probes. The present invention is different. This invention does not use probes but gets the information from the log files.

The above-discussed features of the present invention are of utility because they may be used to provide an availability reporting procedure that is much more efficient, in comparison to data replication or polling, in terms of disk space, network bandwidth and speed.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-5 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 7-10 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 6. Similarly, Claims 12-15 are dependent from, and are allowable with Claim 11; and Claim 17 is dependent from Claim 16 and is allowable therewith. The Examiner is, accordingly, respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow these claims.

12   G:\Ibm\1110\14551\amend\14551.AMD1.doc

Every effort has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, a notice of which is requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S Sensny

John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy

13   G:\Ibm\1110\14551\amend\14551.AMD1.doc